DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 846 CS 009 428

AUTHOR Dunkeld, Colin; Dunbar, Zola
TITLE The Early Detection of Reading Difficulty. The Use of Marie Clay's "Diagnostic Survey and Recovery Procedures" with First-Grade Children.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (28th, Anaheim, CA, May 2-6, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; Classroom Research; Grade 1; Primary Education; *Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Difficulties; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; Reading Skills; Reading Strategies; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Clay (Marie)

ABSTRACT

A study used Marie Clay's complete diagnostic survey (diagnostic survey and recovery procedures from "Early Detection of Reading Difficulty") in two first-grade classrooms in order to ascertain class profiles for January and April of 1983, the reactions of teachers, instructional changes, and changes in the children's reading behaviors over that period of time. Fifty-two suburban first-graders were given the survey, consisting of six parts: (1) three word lists; (2) a running reading record; (3) a letter identification test; (4) "The Concepts about Print Test"; (5) a writing sample; and (6) a dictation test. Results yielded an extensive array of data showing in detail what knowledge, concepts, and strategies children possessed and were using in a number of categories of reading and writing behaviors. Instructional inferences can be made from these data for individual children, but a particular uniform skill hierarchy or sequence of behaviors for all children is not implied. Children's progress seemed to be closely related to reading strategy acquisition. Recommendations included the use of the survey not only for the early detection of reading difficulties, but also for developing teachers' observational skills and concepts of the reading process. (Six tables of data are included.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301846

The Early Detection of Reading Difficulty. The Use of Marie Clay's Diagnostic Survey and Recovery Procedures with First-Grade Children

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Colin Dunkeld

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at 28th Annual Conference
of the International Reading Association

Anaheim, California

Colin Dunkeld and Zola Dunbar
School of Education
Portland State University
Box 751 Portland, Oregon, 97207, USA

April 1984

CS009428

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The paper presents a description of the Diagnostic Survey from Marie Clay's Early Detection of Reading Difficulty, and an exploration of its use in two first grade classrooms.

A total of 52 children, 28 girls and 24 boys, were given the complete Diagnostic Survey in January and again in April. Tables report the scores of all of the chidren on all six sections of the test in both January and April. The January and April profiles are described and changes over the four-month period are discussed in some detail. Five distinct levels of reading development were noted in each classroom by mid-January with considerable diversity of reading and writing ability within each level. Even children who had been working together with the same teacher in the same classroom from September to January developed quite different reading strategies and displayed highly individualized instructional needs.

The teachers' reactions to the data are reported. A number of conclusions are presented, and recommendations are made.

The Early Detection of Reading Difficulty: The Use of Marie Clay's Diagnostic Survey and Recovery Procedures with First Grade Children

Colin Dunkeld and Zola Dunbar
Portland State University

Introduction

Marie Clay is a New Zealand educator and researcher who for several years has studied the early stages of reading acquisition by five, six, and seven-year old children in New Zealand schools. One result of her work has been the publication, now in its second edition, of The Early Detection of Reading Difficulty: A Diagnostic Survey with Recovery Procedures (Clay 1979). The survey is individually administered, takes from 20 to 30 minutes per child, and yields a comprehensive profile of the emerging reading behavior of young children. Parts of the survey resemble an informal reading inventory and in a very general way are familiar to American reading teachers. However, a considerable amount of detailed observation is called for, some of it subjective, and other parts of the survey, notably The Concepts About Print Test, are clearly innovative.

Our first formal experiences with the survey came in 1981 and 1982. At that time we visited kindergarten and first-grade classrooms, gave the survey to a number of children, and discussed our findings with the teachers. We found the survey so informative and so much in harmony with our own views on the early stages of reading acquisition that we wished to explore it further.

The timing of the survey is quite important. It should be given after children have had enough experiences for emerging reading behaviors to be observed, but before faulty habits and processes have had a chance to become established. In New Zealand, children enter school on their fifth birthday. Marie Clay recommends that in addition to the normal monitoring of children's progress that happens from day to day, some formal evaluation should take place at or around the child's sixth birthday, after he has experienced approximately one year of formal reading development in the school. Our early experiences suggested to us

that January of the first-grade year would be a propitious time for the use of the survey in American schools. Many children today enter first grade with some reading experiences from the kindergarten and their homes. Most are well under way by January. Yet January is early enough in the first-grade year for a number of adjustments to be made if necessary. Accordingly we were interested in the use of the survey at that time.

We therefore returned to one of the schools where we had familiarized ourselves with the survey the previous year. We chose this school for a number of reasons.

1. It is a stable school of medium size and generally average levels of achievement.
2. It draws students from several neighborhoods representing a number of different socio-economic levels.
3. It has two sections of the first grade.
4. The two first-grade teachers were already familiar with the survey from the previous year. They understood our interest and were not likely to be inconvienced by our presence.
5. The two teachers had established themselves as good teachers who were willing to respond and to innovate if necessary. One had two years of teaching experience. The other had three.

We requested and obtained permission from the school and from the district:

1. To test all of the children in both first-grade sections in January 1983.
2. To discuss the results of the testing with the classroom teachers, consider their implications, and suggest instructional procedures. We indicated a willingness to assist if requested.
3. To test all of the children again at the end of April and once again discuss our findings with the teachers.

We were interested in the class profiles for January and April, the reaction of the teachers, the instructional changes, and the changes in children's reading behaviors over that period of time.

The Diagnostic Survey

The diagnostic survey consists of six parts:

1. Three word lists
2. A running reading record
3. A letter identification test
4. The Concepts About Print Test
5. A writing sample
6. A dictation test

The word lists are made up from the reading materials in use with the children being tested. In this case both classrooms were using the Houghton-Mifflin Basal Reading Program.

Three lists of fifteen words each were randomly selected from the first pre-primer, the second pre-primer, and the primer of that program. The word lists are read aloud by children while the teacher keeps a record. They yield an estimate of each child's sight vocabulary.

The running reading record is also based on children's oral reading from materials in use in the classroom. Three short passages of 43, 57, and 59 words complete with illustrations and judged to be representative of each level were selected from the first pre-primer, the second pre-primer and the primer materials. As each child reads aloud, he is tape recorded, and the examiner makes a pencil record of his errors. From this record an analysis of the children's reading strategies can be made.

The letter identification test is a list of all of the capital and lower case letters of the alphabet. Children are shown the letters and asked what they are called. Teachers note their responses and also note whether they respond with letter names or letter sounds.

The Concepts About Print Test requires a specially prepared story booklet which the child and teacher read together. Two booklets, Sand and Stones of equivalent difficulty are available. Each booklet contains a simple story with illustrations and a number of deliberate changes in picture and print inversion, line order, word order, and letter order. A series of twenty four questions and instructions such as: show me where to start?, which way do I go?, what's wrong with this?, what's this for?, show me just one word, enables the teacher to assess a child's directional patterns, perceptual skills, confirmational strategies, knowledge of punctuation symbols, and knowledge of the vocabulary teachers use during reading instruction.

The writing sample is obtained by asking the child to write some words such as his name and a number of other words he might know, some sentences, or even a story if he is able.

The dictation test is administered by asking a child to write two simple sentences. The test provides information about a child's awareness of phonemes, handwriting, and placement of letters in a word and words on a page.

The January Profiles

Testing materials were assembled and a record booklet was prepared for each child. There were 52 children in the first grade, 26 in each room; 28 were girls and 24 were boys. Testing was done individually in a small unused classroom near the first-grade rooms. All of the testing was completed in seven morning sessions in the second and third weeks of January.

The children appeared to be very much at ease and were cooperative in every way. No difficulties of any kind were encountered.

The results are displayed in Tables 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B. We have not used the children's real names. In Tables 1A and 1B, column 1 lists the names of the children, and column 2 lists their ages on January 1, 1983. Columns 3-8 summarize their scores on the word lists and the running reading record. Each child

TABLE 1A

SUMMARY OF DIAGNOSTIC READING SURVEY — CLASS 1A — JANUARY 1983

Names		Age Jan 1	Sight Vocab		Reading				Letter Identify			Concepts About Print					Writing					Dictate	
			PP	P	PP1	PP2	P	ReT	Cap	LC	Sd	Dir	Vis	Punc	Voc	Total	Nm	Wds	Dir	Pcl	Fm	Ph	Wds
			15	15	43	57	59		26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24						37	16
April	g	6.2	0		1				25	26	25	9	2	2	4	17	+	+	+	-	+	15	2
Chris	b	6.10	15	14			53	G	25	26	25	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	12
Diana	g	6.7	14	14		57	53	F	26	28	28	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	-	37	16
Donny	b	7.4	15	15			58	E	26	27	27	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	+	36	14
Douglas	b	7.0	0	1					25	23	23	10	1	2	3	16	+	+	+	+	-	20	3
Ellen	g	6.2	14	15		57	59	E	26	28	26	10	4	3	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	36	12
Frank	b	6.4	0	1					26	27	22	10	1	1	2	14	+	+	+	+	-	21	4
Gilbert	b	7.4	1		0				26	24	23	10	3	3	4	20	+	+	+	-	+	34	5
Jane	g	6.11	15	15			59	E	26	26	25	10	6	2	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	12
Jason	b	7.6	15	12		52	48	P	26	27	26	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	36	13
Jenny	g	6.0	15	15			49	P	26	28	27	10	1	4	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	36	13
Jenson	b	6.4	10		37			F	26	27	25	10	4	2	4	20	+	+	+	+	-	37	7
Jerry	b	7.3	0		0				25	23	28	9	1	1	1	12	+	+	+	-	-	6	1
Kay	g	6.11	12	4		55		G	26	28	28	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	+	35	12
Kerri	g	6.9	10		42	54		G	26	28	27	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	36	7
Lamont	b	6.10	0		0				24	24	19	10	2	2	3	17	+	+	+	+	+	1	1
Laurie	g	6.4	15	15			59	G	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	-	+	37	16
Min	b	7.1	15	9		42		F	26	28	28	10	1	4	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	34	11
Nick	b	7.1	0		0				13	10	8	8	1	0	3	12	+	-	+	+	-	2	1
Norma	g	7.8	13	14		57	52	G	26	27	26	10	3	3	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	35	10
Stacey	g	7.0	15	15			59	E	26	28	25	10	6	2	4	22	+	+	+	+	-	37	16
Tammy	g	6.6	15	15			53	G	26	27	27	10	4	3	4	21	+	+	+	+	-	36	12
Tess	g	7.4	1		1				23	23	25	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	-	+	36	8
Toni	g	6.9	15	15			58	E	26	27	27	9	4	2	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	37	15
Trish	g	7.11	13	6		44		G	26	26	25	10	4	3	4	21	+	+	+	-	+	37	11
Yolanda	g	6.5	0		0				26	25	21	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	29	4

TABLE 1B

SUMMARY OF DIAGNOSTIC READING SURVEY — CLASS 1B — JANUARY 1983

Names		Age Jan 1	Sight Vocab		Reading				Letter Identify			Concepts About Print					Writing					Dictate	
			pp	p	pp1	pp2	P	ReT	Cap	LC	Sd	Dir	Vis	Punc	Voc	Total	Nm	Wds	Dir	Pcl	Fm	Ph	Wds
			15	15	43	57	59		26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24						37	16
Alice	g	6.5	12		32	54		G	26	27	26	10	6	3	4	23	+	+	+	-	+	37	14
Angie	g	7.0	0		1				25	26	22	10	1	1	4	16	+	+	+	+	-	21	3
Elise	g	6.6	3		3				26	25	26	6	1	0	4	11	+	+	+	+	+	32	6
Emma	g	6.11	15	15		57	59	G	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	-	37	14
Evan	b	7.7	7		36			G	26	25	24	10	1	1	4	16	+	+	+	+	+	35	4
Gordon	b	7.0	2		1				24	25	21	10	2	3	3	18	+	+	+	+	-	8	2
Greg	b	6.7	3		7			P	26	26	27	10	1	3	4	18	+	+	+	+	-	13	4
Jean	g	6.3	15	15			57	G	26	28	26	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	+	-	36	16
John	b	6.10	12	9		54		G	25	25	26	9	1	2	2	14	+	+	+	+	-	36	8
Josh	b	6.6	13	11		54		F	26	27	27	9	3	1	3	16	+	+	+	+	-	36	8
Knud	b	7.5	9		42	53		G	26	26	25	10	0	1	4	15	+	+	+	+	-	37	6
Lana	g	7.10	15	15			59	E	26	27	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Louise	g	6.4	8		43			E	25	27	27	10	4	3	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	36	9
Mack	b	7.9	0		0				19	8	0	8	1	1	1	11	+	-	-	-	-	3	1
Manual	b	6.10	1		1				22	26	26	5	1	3	4	13	+	+	+	+	+	1	1
Mark	b	6.10	2		4				26	27	25	10	1	1	3	15	+	+	+	+	+	13	5
Natasha	g	7.0	11		41	50		F	26	27	27	10	3	2	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	28	6
Nathan	b	7.1	14	11		55		G	26	26	25	10	4	2	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	36	12
Parush	b	6.10	3			6			25	25	24	9	0	1	4	14	+	+	+	-	-	13	2
Rachael	g	6.8	11	6	42	53		F	26	26	25	9	2	2	4	17	+	+	+	+	+	36	13
Rusty	b	7.0	15	15			59	E	26	28	28	10	6	4	3	23	+	+	+	+	-	36	13
Susan	g	6.6	12	4		43		F	25	26	27	10	2	2	3	17	+	+	+	-	+	33	9
Tabby	g	6.2	14	3		48		F	26	28	26	10	1	2	4	17	+	-	+	-	-	36	6
Tessa	g	8.2	14	11		52		G	26	27	23	10	2	3	4	19	+	+	+			35	13
Timothy	b	7.0	15	14			57	E	26	27	27	10	2	3	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	36	11
Tish	g	7.1	14	8		50		E	26	27	27	10	5	2	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	36	9

was asked to read 15 words from the pre-primer word list. If he read more than 12 of these words successfully without difficulty, he was asked to read 15 words from the primer list. Columns 3 and 4 record the number of words identified correctly. Each child was then asked to read the pre-primer reading passage judged appropriate for him. If he did well he was asked to read the next passage. The first pre-primer contained 43 words, the second pre-primer contained 57 words, and the primer passage contained 59 words. The scores in columns 5, 6, and 7, show which passages were read by each child and record the number of words identified correctly in each passage. After the reading of the highest passage, the child was asked to retell the story in his own words and given a subjective rating of 0 for no response, P for poor, F for fair, G for good, and E for excellent. Those ratings are displayed in column 8. Columns 9, 10, and 11 display the scores earned on the Letter Identification Test. Column 9 records each child's score out of a total of 26 for knowledge of either the names or the sounds of the capital letters. Column 10 records each child's score for knowledge of the names of the lower case letters and column 11 records each child's score for the sounds of the lower case letters. The maximum score is 28 rather than 26 because the list of lower case letters contained two commonly encountered forms of the lower case 'a' and two of the lower case 'g'. Columns 12-16 summarize children's scores on The Concepts About Print Test. Items have been grouped into four very loosely defined categories for convenience. Ten of the questions on this test are concerned with directional matters. Six are concerned with careful visual inspection. Four items test children's knowledge of punctuation symbols, and four more test children's knowledge of some of the vocabulary of reading instructions. Children's scores in each category are displayed in columns 12-15 and the total is recorded in column 16. The order in which they are reported differs slightly from the order in which they were given. A more detailed breakdown is presented in Tables 3A and 3B and will be discussed later. Columns 17-23 summarize children's scores on the writing sample and dictation test. Plus marks in

columns 17-21 indicate that children could write their names, write at least three words, move from left to right across the paper, grip the pencil comfortably and correctly, and use correct letter forms. Minus marks in these columns indicate that children had difficulty with those tasks. The examiner made notes on those papers where difficulties were observed.

Column 22 lists the number of phonemes out of a total of 37 that each child represented satisfactorily in the dictation test. Column 23 lists the number of words out of a total of 16 that each child correctly spelled on the same test.

These summaries show very quickly that most children have learned the names and sounds of all of the capital and lower case letters and most children are familiar with the language of instruction. Most children can write their names and a few words and haye good directional habits in both reading and writing. The summaries provide useful information about children's sight vocabularies and their knowledge of punctuation symbols. They show that a number of children are having difficulties with letter form in handwriting. They show very clearly that knowledge of letter sounds, which most children have mastered very well, is not all that is needed for reading to take place.

The most valuable information in our judgment is that gained from a careful study of each child's running reading record. This information is somewhat subjective and difficult to quantify, however it is based on observable evidence and allows very important descriptive statements to be made about a child's reading strategies such as:

x uses phonics and uses context - but very slowly and independent of each other.

y reads with expression. Uses context. Checks her predictions. Makes corrections.

Brief notes of this nature were written on each child's running reading record while the child was reading. After all of the reading had been done, each record was

studied carefully again and a summary statement written at the bottom of the record. In composing the summary statement, we paid very careful attention to the child's correction strategies, the semantic acceptability and the grammaticality of his substitutions, and evidence of overt use of phonic or structural analysis. Those statements are listed in Tables 2A and 2B. For convenience they have been grouped according to recommended reading levels. Column 1 lists each child's name. Column 2 lists the level of the reading passage and the child's error ratio on that passage. For example, $\frac{PP2}{1/10}$ means that the child read the second pre-primer passage and made one error for each 10 running words. $\frac{P}{0/59}$ means that the child read the primer passage and made no errors in 59 running words. Column 3 contains the descriptive statements of the child's reading strategies. The groupings represent the examiner's recommended reading level for each child, taking all of these behaviors into consideration.

One immediate conclusion from the results displayed in this manner is that not only are there five discreet ability groupings within each section, there is also a considerable diversity of individual needs within each group. Even children who have been working together under the same teacher in the same classroom with the same basal reading materials, though at different levels, from September to January develop quite different reading strategies and display highly individualized instructional needs.

Tables 3A and 3B display the children's performances in each classroom on The Concepts About Print Test in more detail than is given in Table 1.

Only one or two children have difficulty with directional matters: that in the English writing system we move from left to right across the page with return sweeps at the end of each line and that we move from top to bottom and from the left page to the right page throughout the book. Very few children had any difficulty with the vocabulary of instruction - word, letter, first word, first letter, capital etc. Most of the children knew what a period was and what a question mark was, but a number of them were uncertain about commas and question marks.

TABLE 2A

READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1A JANUARY 1983

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		Entry Level
April	PP 1 9/10	No sight words. Found letter 'a'. No other strategies.
Douglas	PP 1 9/10	Knew 'a'. Saw 'on' - said it would be 'in' if 'o' was an 'i'. No other strategies.
Frank	PP 1 9/10	No strategies. Found 'a'. No other sight words.
Gilbert	PP 1 10/10	Read two words on the picture. Read no as on. Read can as cat then correctly. Uses sounds.
Jerry	PP 1 10/10	No sight words. Minimal phonic attempts.
Lamont	PP 1 10/10	No sight words. Looked at words. Read for as to. No strategies.
Nick	PP 1 10/10	No sight words. No strategies.
Tess	PP 1 9/10	Says, "I have to sound it out," but doesn't! No strategies.
Yolanda	PP 1 10/10	No sight vocab. Tries sounds of letters.
		First Pre-Primer Level
Jenson	PP 1 1/7	Word by word. Attempts to use context.
		Second Pre-Primer Level
Jason	PP 2 1/11	Uses sounds and context. Tries.
Kerri	PP 2 1/19	Sounds out. Looks for picture clues. Little use of sentence context.
Min	PP 2 1/4	Good sight words. Many grammatically unacceptable substitutions. Omits hard words. (Native language is S.E. Asian.)
Trish	PP 2 1/4	Uses context. Does not match print to contextual guesses. Few corrections. Many omissions.

TABLE 2A (continued)
READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1A JANUARY 1983

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		Primer Level
Chris	P 1/10	Word by word. Finds parts in/to. Little context. No matching.
Diana	P 1/10	Word by word. Is aware when wrong. Little awareness of sentence. Looks at pictures. Waits. Tries.
Jenny	P 1/6	Word by word. Little use of context. Misunderstood the story. No matching.
Kay	PP 2 1/29	Carefu. Uses first letter sounds. Does use sentence context.
Norma	P 1/8	Reads slowly. Sounds out. Looks for picture clues. Tries hard to make sense - gave reasons.
Tammy	P 1/10	Tries to use context. Sounds out. Reads with expression.
		First Reader Level
Donny	P 1/59	Excellent at this level
Ellen	P 0/59	Sounds out. Breaks words into parts. Uses context. Makes corrections.
Jane	P 0/59	Good expression. Matches context and print.
Laurie	P 0/59	Very good.
Stacey	P 0/59	Excellent at this level
Toni	P 1/59	Very good.

TABLE 2B

READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1B JANUARY 1983

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		Entry Level
Angie	PP 1 9/10	Tried phonics once. No other strategies.
Elise	PP 1 7/10	Sound initial consonants and finds others. Word by word. No sentence sense yet.
Gordon	PP 1 9/10	Tries to sound out. Looks for familiar words.
Mack	PP 1 1/1	No sight words. Tries to sound out first letters of words. Discouraged?
Manual	PP 1 9/10	Only two sight words. No strategies.
Parush	PP 1 1/2	Uses phonics. Use context. Very slow. Has few sight words.
		First Pre-Primer Level
Evan	PP 1 1/6	Sounds out. Uses context. Does not always match the two.
Greg	PP 1 1/3	Finds sight words. Sounds out words. Talks "c and k make same sound!" Does not use context.
Mark	PP 1 4/10	Has a few sight words. Sounds out small words. No context yet.
		Second Pre-Primer Level
Alice	PP 2 1/19	Uses phonics. Uses context. Really tries.
John	PP 2 1/19	Sounds out. Aware when context does not match.
Josh	PP 2 1/19	Uses context. Reads with expression.
Knud	PP 2 1/14	Sounds out. Uses finger. Tries hard. Little use of context.

TABLE 2B (continued)
READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1B JANUARY 1983

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
Second Pre-Primer Level (continued)		
Louise	PP 1 0/43	Sounds out. Uses context. Makes good corrections.
Natasha	PP 2 1/8	Omits unknown words. No overt phonics. No context. Depends on sight words.
Nathan	PP 2 1/28	Uses all strategies but rushes on too quickly.
Rachael	PP 2 1/14	Sounds out. Aware of errors but little use of context.
Susan	PP 2 1/4	Sounds out. Uses context. Does not match the two.
Tabby	PP 2 1/6	Quick glance at whole words. No phonics yet. No context yet.
Tessa	PP 2 1/10	Sounds out first. Does use context. Makes corrections.
Tish	PP 2 1/8	Strong use of context. Hurried use of phonics at times.
	Primer Level	
Jean	P 1/30	Uses context. Quick. Not much checking.
Timothy	P 1/30	Uses all strategies. Favors phonics over context.
	First Reader Level	
Emma	P 0/59	Excellent at this level. Good expression.
Lana	P 0/59	Excellent at this level. Good expression.
Rusty	P 0/59	Excellent at this level. Good expression.

TABLE 3A

CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT TEST — CLASS 1A — JANUARY 1983

	Total (24)	Front	Print	Top L	L → R	Return Sw.	Word Match	First Last	Invert Pic.	Inv. Print	L Page → R	Line Sequ.	Word Sequ.	Letter Sequ.	Let. Re ord	Match Caps	was - no	Question	Period	Comma	Quotes	Letters	Words	First Let.	Capital
April	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Chris	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Diana	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Donny	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Douglas	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Ellen	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Frank	14	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Gilbert	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Jane	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Jason	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Jenny	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jenson	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Jerry	12	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+
Kay	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kerri	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lamont	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Laurie	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Min	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Nick	12	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Norma	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Stacey	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tammy	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Tess	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Toni	19	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Trish	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Yolanda	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

TABLE 3B

CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT TEST — CLASS 1B — JANUARY 1983

	Total (24)	Front	Print	Top L	L → R	Return Sw.	Word Match	First Last	Invert Pic.	Inv. Print	L Page → R	Line Sequ.	Word Sequ.	Letter Sequ.	Let. Re ord	Match Caps	was - no	Question	Period	Comma	Quotes	Letters	Words	First Let.	Capital
Alice	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Angie	15	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Elise	11	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Emma	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Evan	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Gordon	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Greg	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Jean	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
John	14	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
Josh	15	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Knud	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lana	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Louise	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Mack	11	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
Manual	13	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+
Mark	15	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+
Natasha	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Nathan	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Parush	14	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Rachael	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rusty	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Susan	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Tabby	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Tessa	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Timothy	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Tish	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

Concepts About Print Test

Column 1 lists the children's names. Column 2 lists their total score on the test. The headings in columns 3 through 26 mean as follows:

Directional Patterns 3 - 12

3 Front. The child is asked to show the front of the book.
4 Print. The child shows that it is the print, not the picture, that contains the message.
5 Top L. The child starts at the top left.
6 L R. The child proceeds from left to right.
7 Return Sw. The child returns to the left of each succeeding line of print.
8 Word Match. The child points to each word to match exactly the examiner's reading.
9 First Last. The child correctly indicates first and last part of a story, a line, or a word.
10 Invert Pic. The child indicates that a picture is upside down.
11 Inv. Print. The child indicates that the print is upside down.
*12 L Page R. The child indicates that a left page is read before a right page.

Perceptual Skills - Confirmational Strategies

*13 Line Sequ. The child indicates that the lines are printed in the wrong order.
14 Word Sequ. The child indicates that the words are in the wrong order.
15 Letter Sequ. The child indicates that the letters are in the wrong order.
16 Let. Re ord. The child indicates that letters within a word are in the wrong order.
17 Match Caps. The child correctly finds lower case letters to match selected capitals.
18 was-no. The child correctly finds the words, was and no, in a passage which also contains saw and on.

Punctuation Symbols

19 Question. The child gave the name or explained the function of a question mark.
20 Period. The child gave the name or explained the function of a period.
21 Comma. The child gave the name or explained the function of a comma.
22 Quotes. The child gave the name or explained the function of quotation marks.

Vocabulary of Instruction

23 Letters. The child correctly indicated one letter and two letters.
24 Words. The child correctly indicated one word and two words.
25 First Let. The child correctly indicated the first and the last letter of a word.
26 Capital. The child located a capital letter.

Plus marks in each column indicate success. Minus marks indicate incorrect responses.

*The order in which these are reported here differs from the order in which they are given in the test.

The greatest difficulty experienced by the children particularly those in the lowest groups was spotting changes in line order, word order, and letter order. Presumably this indicates that the habit of confirming one's predictions about context by checking them against the print is a difficult strategy. However, almost every child could match capital letters with their lower case counterparts. Most children found this task very easy indeed and matched capital and lower case letters with great speed.

At the end of January, this information was presented to the two teachers and they were given copies of the summary tables. It must be remembered that these two teachers had experienced these procedures once before, a year ago, so they were generally familiar with the concepts of the diagnostic survey and aware of its purposes and detail. The number of concepts tested and the amount of detail presented by this survey can be overwhelming, even threatening, to some teachers unless the teachers themselves have been trained to collect the data. The survey places a much stronger emphasis upon prediction and confirmation strategies, the use of context, and the importance of the sentence, than most instructional or diagnostic materials in use today in American schools. Some teachers are a little annoyed that concepts such as comma and quotation marks are tested at this time. American teachers however expect letter identification, phonic knowledge, "sounding and blending," to be tested at least in isolation. They are not quite as familiar with the need to observe the interaction between graphophonic clues and contextual clues with very young readers as this survey implies. The survey also assumes greater familiarity with writing and more attention to the content of children's writing, rather than its form, than is usually expected in American schools today.

The two teachers were very interested in the data and hunted through the record booklets seeking information on particular points for individual children. There were no real surprises. For the most part the data supported and sometimes extended the teacher's day to day observations of their children. Offers of

assistance were made but declined at this time. Both teachers understood the intent of the survey and the implications of the data and felt quite confident about their ability to plan appropriate programs and implement appropriate recovery procedures.

About six weeks later, immediately after Spring vacation in mid March, the teachers saw no real reason to turn down an offer of assistance so they arranged for one of us to provide an hour's extra assistance with some of the lower children from each room three mornings a week. We did so and spent most of the instructional time teaching and encouraging the lowest achievers to use their strong knowledge of letter sounds to write their thoughts on paper in complete sentences and read their work to each other. We provided functional help on punctuation when needed and wasted no time teaching conventions that individual children had already mastered. For example, one child, one of the lowest achievers, gave a completely correct explanation of the uses of to, too, and two.

We stressed that reading is a search for meaning. We complimented children when they used their strong strategies and helped them become aware of and develop their weak ones. We showed children how to use both contextual and graphophonic clues to predict the meaning of a sentence and to confirm that meaning.

The two teachers used a conventional organizational plan with four reading groups in each classroom. The teachers felt a strong obligation to follow the materials and instructional suggestions of the basal reading program. Little time was available for consistent, intensive, individualized help. The school arranged for supplementary phonics programs to be given to some of the lowest achievers in each room.

The April Profile

In late April, over a period of six mornings, we gave the entire survey to every child in both first-grade sections. Once again, the testing was accomplished without difficulty. This time, because of the progress made over the four-month

period, and because six children had left the school, testing took much less time. We chose late April so that we would not be rushed or competing with the numerous activities that schools undertake at the end of the school year.

Data are displayed in the same formats as the January data in Tables 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6A, and 6B.

Comparisons between January and April show improvement on all parts of the survey for most children as would be expected. Two children, Nick, and Mack, stand out as having made very little progress of any kind and being clearly in need of immediate and probably sustained assistance. Neither of them approach reading as a search for meaning. Mack though is willing to try to spell words he would like to write.

Natasha and Rachael have made very little progress in passage reading. Their running reading records show that they are still dependent upon single strategies. Natasha uses context but does not check her predictions against the print. Rachael inspects words and letters very carefully but is not seeking meaning. Both need assistance. Five others, Ellen, Jane, Laurie, Emma, and Rusty, have made little progress between January and April but appear to be developing balanced strategies. Their is no apparent reason why they should not progress if they continue to use these strategies on meaningful passages at an appropriate level of difficulty.

Other special needs are as follows:

Class 1A

Lamont. Has difficulty with the direction of written letters. Writes capital O and some small words like on backwards.

Yolanda. Skips too many words.

Jeremy. Capable but very timid. Needs much encouragement to spell.

Tammy and Donny both need help with the form and spacing of written letters.

TABLE 4A

SUMMARY OF DIAGNOSTIC READING SURVEY — CLASS 1A — APRIL 1983

Names		Age May 1	Sight Vocab		Reading				Letter Identify			Concepts About Print					Writing					Dictate	
			pp	p	pp1	pp2	P	ReT	Cap	LC	Sd	Dir	Vis	Punc	Voc	Total	Nm	Wds	Dir	Pcl	Fm	Ph	Wds
			15	15	43	57	59		26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24						37	16
April	g	6.6	14			51		G	26	28	28	10	1	1	4	16	+	+	+	+	+	36	9
Chris	b	7.2	14	15			59	E	26	28	27	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	+	36	15
Diana	g	6.11		15			59	E	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Donny	b	7.8	15	15			59	E	26	28	27	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	+	36	15
Douglas																							
Ellen	g	6.6	13	14			57	E	26	28	26	10	4	4	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Frank	b	6.8	15	7		55		G	26	27	27	10	3	2	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Gilbert	b	7.8	12	11		55		G	25	26	25	10	2	4	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Jane	g	7.3	15	15			57	E	26	28	27	10	6	2	2	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Jason																							
Jenny																							
Jensen	b	6.8	15	14			55	E	26	26	28	10	3	1	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	37	15
Jerry	b	7.7	13			48		G	26	26	27	8	2	1	3	14	+	+	+	+	+	9/12	2/4
Kay	g	7.3	13	14			59	E	26	28	28	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Kerri	g	7.1	14	15			49	E	26	28	26	10	3	2	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Lamont	b	7.2	12	10		53		G	23	25	26	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	34	9
Laurie	g	6.8	15	15			57	E	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Min	b	7.5	15	15			57	E	26	28	28	10	3	2	4	19	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Nick	b	7.5	1		3/10			O	22	25	25	10	1	2	4	17	+	+	+	+	+	6/12	1/4
Norma	g	8.0	14	15			57	E	26	27	27	10	3	4	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Stacey																							
Tammy	g	6.10	15	15			59	E	26	27	27	10	4	4	4	22	+	+	+	-	-	37	15
Tess																							
Toni	g	7.1	15	15			58	E	26	28	27	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Trish	g	8.3	14	15			54	E	25	27	27	10	4	4	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	13
Yolanda	g	6.9	14	15			52	G	26	27	26	10	2	1	4	17	+	+	+	+	+	37	13

TABLE 4B

SUMMARY OF DIAGNOSTIC READING SURVEY — CLASS 1B — APRIL 1983

Names		Age May 1	Sight Vocab		Reading				Letter Identify			Concepts About Print					Writing					Dictate	
			pp	p	ppl	pp2	P	ReT	Cap	LC	Sd	Dir	Vis	Punc	Voc	Total	Nm	Wds	Dir	Pct	Fm	Ph	Wds
			15	15	43	57	59		26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24						37	16
Alice	g	6.9	15	15			56	E	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Angie	g	7.4	13	5		54		F	25	24	26	10	1	0	4	15	+	+	+	-	+	35	12
Elise	g	6.10	13	10		56		G	20	27	27	10	6	1	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	36	12
Emma	g	7.3		15			59	E	26	28	28	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	15
Evan	b	7.11	14	12		51		G	26	25	27	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	36	13
Gordon	b	7.4	15	15		53		G	26	28	28	10	1	1	4	16	+	+	+	+	+	35	14
Greg	b	6.11	13			56	55	G	25	26	25	10	5	4	4	23	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Jean	g	6.7	15	15			59	E	26	28	25	10	6	3	4	23	+	+	+	+	-	37	15
John																							
Josh	b	6.10	15	15			58	E	25	28	25	10	5	3	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	16
Knud	b	7.9	14	15			55	E	26	27	26	10	1	1	4	16	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Lana	g	8.2	15	15			58	E	26	28	26	10	6	4	4	24	+	+	+	+	+	37	15
Louise	g	6.8	13	13			56	E	26	28	28	10	4	4	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Mack	b	8.1	0		9/10			0	20	17	17	6	1	1	2	10	+	-	+	+	-	4/12	0/4
Manual	b	7.2	13			57		G	26	26	25	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	34	13
Mark	b	7.2	15	14			50	F	26	26	27	10	1	2	4	17	+	+	+	+	+	35	14
Natasha	g	7.4	11	13		53	47	G	26	28	27	10	4	4	3	21	+	+	+	+	-	35	9
Nathan	b	7.5	15	15			57	E	26	28	27	10	6	2	4	22	+	+	+	+	+	37	13
Parush	b	7.2	11		41	55		G	25	27	27	10	4	3	4	21	+	+	+	+	-	36	12
Rachael	g	7.0	14	13		52	49	G	26	28	28	10	2	4	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	36	14
Rusty	b	7.4	15	15			57	E	26	28	28	10	3	4	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	37	15
Susan	g	6.10	14	15			51	G	25	25	26	10	2	2	4	18	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Tabby	g	6.6	14	15			51	G	26	28	28	9	2	2	2	15	+	+	+	+	+	29	10
Tessa	g	8.6	15	14		54	53	G	26	28	27	10	3	3	4	20	+	+	+	+	+	37	14
Timothy	b	7.4	15	15			58	E	26	28	28	10	5	2	4	21	+	+	+	+	-	36	14
Tish	g	7.5	15	15			57	E	26	28	28	10	5	2	4	21	+	+	+	+	+	37	12

TABLE 5A

READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1A APRIL 1981

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		First-Pre-Primer
Nick	PP 1 1/3	Many unknown words. Tries sounding. Very slow. No search for meaning. Delays.
		Second Pre-Primer Level
April	PP 2 1/10	Looks carefully. Much attention to sounds. Read rack for race. Tries to make sense.
Frank	PP 2 1/28	Good use of context. Good corrections. Expression at times. Primer was too hard. Found a few sight words.
Gilbert	PP 2 1/28	Makes some corrections. Checks print too quickly.
Jerry	PP 2 1/6	Struggles. Good balance. Uses context and phonics. Looks for meaning.
Lamont	PP 2 1/14	Does correct. Not much evidence of checking.
		Primer Level
Jansen	P 1/15	Does predict context. Not much checking.
Kerri	P 1/6	Corrects successfully. Careful use of letter sounds.
Trish	P 1/12	Good balance. Good corrections.
Yolanda	P 1/8	Skips many words. Does not correct. Ignores punctuation.
		First Reader Level
Ellen	P 1/30	Excellent at this level.
Jane	P 1/30	Excellent at this level.
Laurie	P 1/30	Good strategies.
Min	P 1/30	Good strategies. Very quiet. Careful.
Norma	P 1/30	Good strategies. Acceptable substitutions.

TABLE 5A
READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1A APRIL 1983 (continued)

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		Above First Reader Level
Chris	P 0/59	Excellent.
Diana	P 0/59	Excellent
Donny	P 0/59	Excellent. (Nasal articulation. See speech therapist?)
Kay	P 0/59	Good strategies. Good corrections.
Tammy	P 0/59	Excellent.
Toni	P 1/59	Very good.

TABLE 5B

READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1B APRIL 1983

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
		Entry Level
Mack	PP 1 9/10	Does not even try.
		Second Pre-Primer Level
Angie	PP 2 1/19	Uses sight vocab. and beginning sounds. Not looking for meaning.
Elise	PP 2 1/57	Uses first letter and some context. Tries to correct without success. Struggles at higher level. Should stay at PP 2.
Manual	PP 2 0/57	Much word by word. Careful. Very slow. Not much use of sentence clues.
Natasha	PP 2 1/14	Good balance at PP 2. Not enough checking at P.
Parush	PP 2 1/28	Good balance but slow. Very slow at P.
Rachael	P 1/6	Inspects and corrects sometimes. Does not make sense. Very slow at P. Practice at PP 2.
		Primer Level
Alice	P 1/20	Good strategies. Some corrections. Misses acceptable substitutions.
Evan	P 1/5	Good search for meaning. Frequent correction attempts.
Greg	P 1/6	Uses context. Looks carefully at letters.
Gordon	P 1/15	Does search for meaning. Sounding and blending.
Knud	P 1/15	Good checking. Many good corrections. Uses phonics. Makes sense.
Mark	P 1/7	Good sight vocab. Not aware of poor substitutions. Not seeking meaning. Not correcting. Does use structural analyses.

TABLE 5B
READING STRATEGIES CLASS 1B APRIL 1983 (continued)

Name	Level Tested Error Ratio	Descriptive Statement
Primer Level (continued)		
Nathan	P 1/30	Monotone. Careful. Uses all strategies.
Susan	P 1/7	Many minor errors. Not much checking.
Tabby	P 1/7	Many minor errors. Not much checking.
Tessa	P 1/10	Good balance. Makes corrections.
	First Reader Level	
Emma	P 1/30	Very good. Minor acceptable insertions and omissions.
Josh	P 1/59	Good balance. Acceptable substitutions.
Louise	P 1/20	Good checking.
Rusty	P 1/30	Very good. Minor acceptable substitutions.
Tish	P 1/30	Very good. Good use of sentence punctuation. Does correct.
	Above First Reader Level	
Jean	P 0/59	Excellent.
Lana	P 1/59	Very good.
Timothy	P 1/59	Very good. Checks quickly.

TABLE 6A

CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT TEST CLASS 1A APRIL 1983

	Total (24)	Front	Print	Top L	L → R	Return Sw.	Word Match	First Last	Invert Pic.	Inv. Print	L Page → R	Line Sequ.	Word Sequ.	Letter Sequ.	Let. Re ord	Match Caps	was - no	Question	Period	Comma	Quotes	Letters	Words	First Let.	Capital
April	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Chris	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Diana	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Donny	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Douglas																									
Ellen	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Frank	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Gilbert	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jane	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Jason																									
Jenny																									
Jenson	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Jerry	14	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+
Kay	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Kerri	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lamont	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Laurie	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Min	19	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Nick	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Norma	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stacey																									
Tammy	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tess																									
Toni	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Trish	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Yolanda	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

TABLE 6B

CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT TEST — CLASS 1B — APRIL 1983

	Total (24)	Front	Print	Top L	L → R	Return Sw.	Word Match	First Last	Invert Pic.	Inv. Print	L Page → R	Line Sequ.	Word Sequ.	Letter Sequ.	Let. Re ord	Match Caps	was - no	Question	Period	Comma	Quotes	Letters	Words	First Let.	Capital
Alice	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Angie	15	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Elise	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Emma	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Evan	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Gordon	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Greg	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Jean	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
John																									
Josh	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Knud	16	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lana	24	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Louise	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Mack	10	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Manual	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Mark	17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Natasha	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Nathan	22	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Parush	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Rachael	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rusty	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Susan	18	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tabby	15	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tessa	20	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Timothy	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tish	21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

Class 1B

Jean and Timothy are good readers but both need help with the direction and spacing of handwriting.

Tabby and Susan make many minor mistakes and need to check their own reading with much more care.

Angie, Manual, and Mark are not yet seeking meaning.

All of the others have made good progress. From a limited number of strategies, often with a heavy dependence upon a single strategy, sometimes sight words, sometimes phonics, and sometimes context, children have gained both a broader array of strategies and are employing them more effectively.

In early May, we tabulated, summarized, and assembled all of the data from the April surveys and prepared brief notes for each teacher about individual children as indicated above. We met with the teachers once again and this time asked them a number of questions about their programs and whether the data had affected their teaching. They began by saying that they liked their new basal reading series this year better than the old one because it places a greater and earlier emphasis upon context clues and delays instruction on the vowels until a lot later than their former series. They said that a basal reading program places heavy demands upon teachers and that to follow the suggestions from the diagnostic survey would leave very little time for anything else. They also felt a strong obligation to follow the basal program. Pressures from the administration, felt mainly through the school and district evaluation program, place a very high premium on decoding which is usually defined as phonics. These pressures also persuade a teacher to place much more emphasis upon reading than on writing and to treat much of the reading program as the building of isolated skills.

As a result of the diagnostic survey they felt that the good scores on letter identification allowed them to spend a little less time on phonics than they otherwise might have done. They included much more writing this year than they

had done in previous years and were glad they had done so. They also paid much more attention to such things as the way children held their pencils, and the direction in which children formed letters and words. They paid more attention this year to the names and use of punctuation marks in reading and writing. The survey reminded them of a number of things to look for day by day. "You know," said one of the teachers, "little flags go up, but you don't always have time to do much about them."

They said that the tests tended to confirm what they already knew or suspected. They also said that there is much that is not brought to light by the tests. A lot is happening in some children that does not show on the tests such as gaining independence in work habits, sustaining attention, and following directions.

For a small number of children, one teacher mentioned Gilbert and Lamont, the survey had not suggested to her what needed to be done. For other children, the teachers knew what was needed but could not always sustain children's interest or attention. Some children bring characteristics with them from their families such as "Rush, rush, rush," on the one hand or, "Don't bother, who cares?" on the other. Some children just need a lot of play and of "thinking time." Others need to be much more attentive. Some are perfectionists. One child cones from a family always in turmoil and cannot keep his mind on anything for more than a minute. Another child cries the moment anything gets difficult. The diagnostic survey may say something about reading strategies, but it does not help very much in these cases.

We were impressed with the amount of detail and the concepts the teachers used in describing the reading and writing behavior and the personal characteristics and work habits of their children. How much, if any, of this can be attributed to their experiences with the survey, we are not in a position to know, but we suspect that its influence was quite strong.

Summary and Conclusions

The diagnostic survey from Marie Clay's book, The Early Detection of Reading Difficulty: A Diagnostic Survey with Recovery Procedures, was administered in January and in late April to two classes of first-grade children in a suburban school. After each administration, data from the survey were tabulated, summarized, and presented to the two classroom teachers. These data were examined and instructional implications were discussed. At the end of the year the teachers were interviewed about their reading programs, what they had learned from the survey, and the effects, if any, that the survey had had upon their teaching.

From these limited experiences we are able to make the following observations:

1. Training and practice is required for the proper administration of the survey. The directions for administering and scoring are clear, but the procedures are numerous, varied, and at times complex. We recommend careful preparation and study followed by at least five practice administrations before attempting to use the survey in a formal setting.
2. Some local adaptations are necessary. Reading passages need to be selected from local materials in use with the children being examined. On this occasion, we selected passages from the first pre primer, second pre primer and primer. These proved adequate for the lower half of the children surveyed, but for future use we would also select passages from at least two levels beyond the primer. It is also recommended that sight word lists be constructed from local reading materials.
3. Further local adaptations are possible. We chose to use the two specially prepared booklets Sand and Stones for the Concepts About Print Test. However almost any illustrated pre primer storybook could be used if a few supplementary cards were prepared with planned alterations

in picture inversion, line inversion, line order, word order, and letter order. In some cases special cards might also be needed to test children's knowledge of punctuation symbols. We also added extra scoring categories for reading comprehension and certain aspects of handwriting.

4. The survey yields an extensive array of data. It shows in detail what knowledge, concepts, and strategies children possess and are using in a number of categories of reading and writing behavior.
5. The wide range of responses suggests that January of the first-grade year is an appropriate time for making a detailed survey of reading behavior especially for low achieving students.
6. Instructional inferences can be made from these data for individual children; but a particular, uniform, skill hierarchy or sequence of behaviors for all children is not implied.
7. Reading strategies and rates of progress are highly individualized. In each classroom, by January of the first-grade year, we found children at five quite different levels of reading ability and we found much diversity within each level.
8. Descriptions of reading strategies are inferences drawn from extensive arrays of data but by their nature cannot be completely objective. Careful interpretation is necessary. Experimentation with a number of systematic procedures needs to be undertaken in an attempt to increase the objectivity of these descriptions.
9. Within the limitations of these interpretations, children's progress appears to be closely related to strategy acquisition. Children with the fewest strategies make the least progress. Children making good progress have acquired and are using a number of strategies. However, a variety of strategies alone does not ensure progress. A small group of children who

displayed an apparently appropriate variety of reading strategies in January made little progress between January and April.

10. While there are some similarities between parts of Clay's diagnostic survey and Reading Miscue Analysis (Goodman and Burke 1972) and both pay attention to predictions, the Clay survey invites a little more attention to be paid to children's confirmational strategies.
11. Diagnostic information from a whole class or selected individuals may influence a teacher's behavior and cause some modification of instruction, but if teachers believe they are locked into the sequence of a basal reading series or a fixed syllabus dictated by a school or district-wide evaluation plan, they may easily be inhibited from making the best use of the information.
12. The widespread and almost routine procedure of prescribing supplementary phonics instruction for all low achieving children seems questionable when knowledge of letter sounds is found to be strong and other strategies are shown to be in need of development.

The survey is comprehensive, informative, and potentially useful. In addition to its intended use for the early detection of reading difficulties, we believe that it is a useful tool for developing teacher's observational skills and concepts of the reading process. For these purposes it is superior to any diagnostic reading tests that we have encountered. We recommend training in the use of the survey in pre-service and in-service programs, and we encourage its routine use in first-grade classrooms.

#